

# United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

DATE MAILED: 08/02/2006

FIRST NAMED INVENTOR APPLICATION NO. ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. CONFIRMATION NO. FILING DATE 10/549,776 09/19/2005 Donald W. Hayward 1-36904 7880 **EXAMINER** 43935 7590 08/02/2006 FRASER MARTIN & MILLER LLC FRANCIS, FAYE 28366 KENSINGTON LANE PAPER NUMBER ART UNIT PERRYSBURG, OH 43551 3725

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
Office Action Summary	10/549,776	HAYWARD ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Faye Francis	3725	
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address	
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DA  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period w  - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be time ill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONE!	i.  lely filed  the mailing date of this communication.  D (35 U.S.C. § 133).	
Status			
Responsive to communication(s) filed on  2a) ☐ This action is <b>FINAL</b> . 2b) ☑ This  3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowant closed in accordance with the practice under E	- action is non-final. ace except for formal matters, pro		
Disposition of Claims			
4)  Claim(s) 1-6 is/are pending in the application.  4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw  5)  Claim(s) is/are allowed.  6)  Claim(s) 1-6 is/are rejected.  7)  Claim(s) is/are objected to.  8)  Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or  Application Papers  9)  The specification is objected to by the Examinet 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) acceed applicant may not request that any objection to the ore Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examinet 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examinet 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examinet 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examinet 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examinet 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examinet 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examinet 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examinet 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examinet 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examinet 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examinet 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examinet 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examinet 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examinet 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examinet 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examinet 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examinet 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examinet 11)	relection requirement.  r.  epted or b) objected to by the Edrawing(s) be held in abeyance. See on is required if the drawing(s) is objected to by the drawing(s) is	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). ected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).	
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119			
<ul> <li>12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).</li> <li>a) All b) Some * c) None of:</li> <li>1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.</li> <li>2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No.</li> <li>3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).</li> <li>* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.</li> </ul>			
Attachment(s)  1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal P 6) Other:		

Application/Control Number: 10/549,776 Page 2

Art Unit: 3725

## **DETAILED ACTION**

## Specification

1. Applicant is reminded of the proper language and format for an abstract of the disclosure.

The abstract should be in narrative form and generally limited to a single paragraph on a separate sheet within the range of 50 to 150 words. It is important that the abstract not exceed 150 words in length since the space provided for the abstract on the computer tape used by the printer is limited. The form and legal phraseology often used in patent claims, such as "means", "said," and "comprises" should be avoided. The abstract should describe the disclosure sufficiently to assist readers in deciding whether there is a need for consulting the full patent text for details.

The language should be clear and concise and should not repeat information given in the title. It should avoid using phrases which can be implied, such as, "The disclosure concerns," "The disclosure defined by this invention," "The disclosure describes," etc.

2. The abstract of the disclosure is objected to because of the use of legal phraseology [note the word "comprises" in line 1. Correction is required. See MPEP § 608.01(b).

# Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

3. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

4. Claims 1-6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

With respect to claim 1: the phrase "the RPET flakes particles having an average mean particle size **less than about 300** microns " is vague since you can pick a value more than 300 and still be within the range about 300 claimed but it would not be less than 300.

### Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
  - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 6. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Art Unit: 3725

7. Claims 1-6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fredle [6,436,322].

Fredle discloses the basic process of treating RPET flakes and subsequent extrusion of the RPET flakes [col 3 lines 23-63].

Fredle does not disclose the RPET flakes particles having an average mean particle size less than 300 microns. However, a mean particle size of less than 300 microns would appear to be an obvious process choice for this type of material size claimed.

#### Conclusion

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Faye Francis whose telephone number is 571-272-4423. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 6:30-3:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Derris Banks can be reached on 571-272-4419. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 3725

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

FF

Faye Francis
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 3725